

they now will enforce environmental standards, this same crowd sent a letter to the Jordan Trade Minister saying: We are not enforcing, we are not going to push you, we are not going to push you on dispute resolution to enforce those labor standards.

Today, as a result, Bangladeshi workers enter Jordan—from one of the poorest countries in the world—they have their passports confiscated, and work in some cases up to 20 hours a day without breaks. Then Jordan exports those goods to the United States. There is no enforcement of labor standards, no enforcement of environmental standards. There is simply the continuation of the exploitation of some of the poorest workers in the world in order to reap more profits and backdoor those products into the United States.

If that is the plan, if that is the Bush administration plan—forget what they talk about on labor standards, forget what they promise on environmental standards—if that is the plan for Peru, if that is the plan for Panama, if that is the plan for Colombia, if that is the plan for South Korea, then they will simply not get the support for these trade agreements. They will not get the support from those who talked about fair trade in their campaigns, not from small business owners, not from small manufacturers such as the local tool and die shop in Akron, the local machine shop in Dayton, not from workers across the country who say: We don't want more of the same.

That is what the elections last fall were all about. I believe every single new Democratic Member of the Senate—there are nine of us—every single one of us has talked about fair trade, not free trade. If this administration thinks by simply saying: We are for labor standards, we are for environmental standards, we will put it in a little side letter here, and then a wink and a nod to their friends in the National Association of Manufacturers, a wink and a nod to the large corporations that benefit from slave labor and child labor, simply giving them a wink and a nod, if they think this Senate and the other body are going to pass this kind of legislation, they are wrong. We know our trade policies have failed. As I said, if they bring back this kind of trade agreement for Peru, for Panama, for Colombia, for Korea without labor and environmental standards in the core agreement and without real commitments to enforce those labor and environmental standards, then those trade agreements aren't going to fly here.

We know our trade policies have failed. When I first ran for Congress, our trade deficit in 1992 was \$38 billion. Even in those days, President Bush—the first President Bush—said a \$1 billion trade deficit represented about 13,000 jobs, mostly manufacturing—many manufacturing jobs. So if you had a \$1 billion trade deficit, it meant it was costing your country a net loss of 13,000 jobs. If you had a trade sur-

plus, it was a gain of 13,000 jobs. That was then a \$38 billion trade deficit in 1992. In 2006, our trade deficit was in the vicinity of \$800 billion—\$800 billion. That means the trade deficit has grown by a factor of 20. If it is 13,000 jobs for every \$1 billion trade deficit, you do the math. It is clear this trade policy has failed. It has failed our workers. It has failed our small manufacturers. It has failed our restaurants and our drugstores in those communities that suffer devastating job loss. It has failed our families. It has failed our country.

The current system is not sustainable. Senator DORGAN has said: We want trade, and plenty of it, but under new rules. That means benchmarks. When we pass trade agreements, we have to show how much this has done for America's wages, how much it has done for American job creation, and we want accountability, something we have never brought to the table on these trade agreements. That does not mean trying to pass off more of the same kind of trade policy, packaging it in a different way, speaking of all the platitudes of the administration and that some others in the House and Senate have spoken about, just simply saying it is new and improved.

Now is not the time for more bad trade deals. We need to pause. We need to have a national conversation about a new direction for trade in the 21st century, a conversation that includes everybody.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I wish to express some thoughts about the earlier statement of the Democratic leader, Senator REID, that he was not going to attempt to bring this bill up for a vote this week. I think that is the only right choice that could have been made. He has been talking about bringing it up this week and actually getting a vote on Friday on a bill that we only got the paperwork on Saturday morning at 2 a.m. It hasn't been substituted yet, to my knowledge.

This is a piece of legislation of enormous complexity which has not gone through the proper committee—the Judiciary Committee. It was written by a group of people who claim they have reached an agreement. The agreement is that on both sides, they are saying nobody can offer an amendment that goes to what they consider the core of it because they will all band together and vote against it. So I guess that means if anybody has a different view about how immigration should be han-

dled, the people I really love and respect, whom I affectionately call “masters of the universe,” are just going to all get together and vote no. So I am not sure what the purpose of having votes is. But presumably, the rest of us, now that we have had a chance to read it, will be able to at least nibble around the edges and offer a few amendments that might make it a little better, and I look forward to that opportunity.

I think it is very important that this bill was not rammed through this week and no attempt was made to do that. I think it would have poisoned the atmosphere. It would have been a very bad scene had that occurred. So now we are talking about 2 weeks of debate. There is no doubt in my mind that this Senate could spend a month easily on this bill—maybe more. It is a critically important piece of legislation. It has much impact on our whole economy, our culture, and our rule of law. We could do better with it if we spend time on it. So I hope we are not in a situation where the leadership—the conferee group which has been meeting—is going to lock together and just vote down anything that displeases them or one side or the other says this is important and shouldn't be amended. So I am worried about that. We will see how it goes.

I hope the American people will take the opportunity to study the legislation. It does have some good things in it. It does have provisions in it that are quite superior to the bill I referred to as fatally flawed last year. But the cloture vote we just took was to move to last year's bill, and unless I am mistaken, we have not seen the new bill that is supposed to be substituted. We haven't seen anything other than a draft of the former bill. It has not been put in legislative language, even in the smaller print in the draft version that has been floated since Saturday. It is 326 pages, but in normal bill language, it will turn out to be probably 800, maybe 1,000 pages with each one of the clauses and phrases. Based on our history of dealing with immigration, it has to be read carefully because experts seem to have the ability—some of these lawyers, particularly—to slip in phrases that can have significance far beyond what might appear to be the case when you first read it. So it needs to be studied carefully.

A lot of people wanted to ram this through before the Memorial Day recess.

I am glad Senator REID has abandoned that and will allow the American people the opportunity to have an extra week to look at it.

I thank my colleagues who have worked on the bill. They are good people. They have it in their heads that they want to fix immigration, and it is time for a comprehensive fix of immigration. There are tough decisions to be made. But I get a little bit worried when time after time I hear people say: Well, there is a lot in it I don't like,

but you know, you just have to live with it. I am not sure we ought to live with anything that doesn't make sense. I am not sure we ought to live with anything that is bad policy. Why do we have to do that? Because this group has met and they said no serious amendments can be changed—adopted that would alter the core of the bill, the basic philosophy of it, I worry about that. We are troubled that a number of things don't quite reach the promised principles that have been floated as part of this discussion.

The trigger is in the bill, but I think it is far too weak. The temporary guest worker program is preferable to last year's, but it is very unsettling to me. I have an odd feeling that this temporary worker program that is in the bill is not going to work. We should not pass anything that won't work. It needs to be done in a better way.

The hoped-for move to a more merit-based system, a point system like Canada does, is troubling because no significant move in that direction appears to be on the horizon for 8 years. It is 8 years before the point system will really take effect. So I am worried about that.

These are fundamental. Will the workplace system be effective? We need to study that language because if it is not done right, it won't work. I will have an opportunity to talk more about this.

I thank my staff and a lot of other staff who have worked their hearts out Saturday, Sunday, and into the night last night and all morning today, trying to read and digest this bill to see what it really means so we can do a better job of serving our constituents.

Finally, the guiding principle, the overarching goal of an immigration bill, must be to serve the national interest. It is not to serve special interests, groups of special interests, businesses, or immigration advocacy groups. It is to serve the national interests, and that means a principled approach that creates a lawful system that serves our economy and our society.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO DEAN RICHARD MORGAN

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the founding dean of the William S. Boyd School of Law at the University of Nevada Las Vegas, Richard "Dick" Morgan. Dick came to Nevada to take on the daunting task of

starting Nevada's first law school. When given the timeframe for starting the school, Dick said it could not be done; then he went out and proved himself wrong many times over. Dick's outstanding success with Boyd School of Law now serves as the model on how to create a new law school of exceptional quality.

Under the Dean's steady hand, Boyd Law School has achieved both provisional and full accreditation with the American Bar Association in record time. The school has received special recognition for its work with the Saltman Center for Conflict Resolution, the Nevada Law Journal, client counseling training, Society of Advocates, and legal writing programs. With amazing rapidity, the school has earned an outstanding reputation for scholarship and high-quality graduates. Already, the school's alumnae are having a tremendous impact on the legal profession in Nevada. They serve as judicial clerks, pro bono attorneys, respected members of law firms throughout the State, legal counsel in Federal and State agencies, and even on my own staff.

On June 30, 2007, Dean Morgan is stepping down as the head of the law school. Although he will be sorely missed, his legacy is tremendous. UNLV's law school dean is leaving us with an outstanding institution that will continue to train the minds of many of our best and brightest students. I am confident that the attorneys trained by the school will be instrumental in guiding the future growth and progress of our State.

When he came to Nevada, he had served as a law professor and as dean of both the Wyoming and Arizona State Colleges of Law. Reflecting on his experience in legal education, Dean Morgan recently honored Nevada by characterizing his 10 years with Boyd School of Law as "the best" of his 27 years in legal education. I am grateful he spent his best years with us. He has certainly been invaluable to the Nevada legal community.

Going forward, Dean Morgan plans a community-service semiretirement. Based on his dedication to UNLV, I am confident that he will be a tremendous asset to any organization he is associated with. I offer Dean Morgan my sincere thanks for all he has done for Nevada and wish him the best on his retirement.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR TED STEVENS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, look up Senator STEVENS' name in media reports and you will find a long list of adjectives: tenacious, temperamental, scrappy, gruff, hot-tempered, tireless. And you will come across a long list of nicknames: one of the Senate's "old bulls" for his institutional knowledge, "Uncle Ted" to the people of Alaska who are grateful for his aggressive advocacy for their interests, pioneer for

flying Army Air Corps missions during World War II and migrating to our rugged 49th State after law school, a mentor to up-and-coming elected officials, reportedly by his wife, a nutrition enthusiast for his devoted consumption of greens and whole grains, in the case of his longtime friend, Senator INOUE of Hawaii, "my brother."

I would like to add a few adjectives of my own.

First, TED STEVENS is an Alaskan. It is impossible to think of Alaska without thinking of its senior Senator. Alaska and TED STEVENS are inseparable. Anyone who knows Senator STEVENS knows he wakes up every morning fighting for the people of Alaska and doesn't stop until he sleeps, which apparently isn't much. Their commercial industry, health care, electricity, water, transportation—even the cost of rural mail delivery—all earn his scrutiny. He has delivered again and again on policy to improve Alaskans' quality of life.

Second, and just as important, TED STEVENS is loyal. He is loyal to the institution of the United States Senate. Bipartisanship is natural for him. He understands that the art of compromise is critical to getting things done. For example, he is known to have helped reach a bipartisan deal on how to conduct the impeachment trial of President Clinton to minimize the partisan bickering that would have sullied the Senate and made a tense time even more tense.

He is more than willing to look across the aisle and find kinship with people of like interests. His friendship with Senator INOUE, a Democrat, is steadfast and legendary. They have found plenty of common ground in delivering good policy to the people of their uniquely situated States. Despite what seems like a gruff exterior sometimes, Senator STEVENS has a reputation for extending generous kindness to his colleagues, such as flying across country to attend the funeral of a former Senator whose vote had once been helpful.

Senator STEVENS' approach to policymaking is guided by Rotary International's "Four-Way Test," a copy of which is framed on his desk in the Senate Chamber. The test reads: "Is it the truth? Is it fair to all concerned? Will it build goodwill and better friendships? Will it be beneficial to all concerned?"

That four-way test was written in 1932, but like Senator STEVENS—and here are more adjectives—it is common sense, inspirational, and timeless.

IDAHO COURTHOUSE AND CHURCH SHOOTINGS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this weekend we witnessed an act of senseless violence in Moscow, ID, the home of the University of Idaho, where someone reportedly laid siege to a courthouse, killing a police officer and